

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached replacement drawing sheets make changes to Figs. 13 and 14 and replace the original sheets with Figs. 13 and 14.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1 and the drawings are amended, and claim 6 is canceled. Support for amended claim 1 may be found in the original specification at, for example, original claim 6.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 since the amendments:

(a) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration (as the amendment merely incorporates features of a previously considered dependent claim into the independent claim); (c) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; (d) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (e) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representatives by Examiner Cavallari and Examiner Deberadinis in the July 3 interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

**Drawing Objection**

The drawings were objected to for allegedly not properly designating the prior art. Replacement drawings of FIGs. 13 and 14 are provided herewith, with a legend designating such as prior art. It is thus respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

Claims 1, 2 and 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004-0169993 ("Nakamura"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Nakamura fails to teach or suggest a vehicle installed relay box including a semiconductor module that has a case provided with an installation socket, wherein the installation socket is further configured to allow a different relay element to be installed in accordance with the selected type of specification from among the different specifications of the vehicle-installed system, as recited in claim 1.

The Patent Office alleges that a unit case 32 of Nakamura reads on a semiconductor module. However, even if this allegation is true, nowhere does Nakamura disclose that unit case 32 (alleged semiconductor) has a case provided with an installation socket, wherein the installation socket is further configured to allow a different relay element to be installed in accordance with the selected type of specification from among the different specifications of the vehicle-installed system, as required in claim 1. In fact, the Patent Office indicates that installation socket 39 of Nakamura is within an electric connection box 21, which is clearly separate from unit case 32 (alleged semiconductor). See Nakamura, FIG. 1. Thus, Nakamura fails to teach or suggest a semiconductor module that has a case provided with the installation socket.

Further, advantages of the claimed structure are not achieved by Nakamura. For example, as mentioned above, the present claims provide a vehicle-installed relay box that includes relay elements configured to have the same outer shape and outer dimensions and that may be different among different models and grades of vehicles. These claimed features allow for miniaturization of the relay box while also allowing for the relay box to be

adaptable to different grades and models of vehicles (see specification, page 10, line 18 to page 11, line 14).

In contrast, Nakamura discloses a common relay unit (27, 34), constituted by a fuse (26, 33) that is common between vehicles or grades of cars and one or more relays relative with the fuse. Thus, as the relay units disclosed in Nakamura are not adaptable to different grades and models of vehicles and are only for common vehicles and grades of cars, the alleged relay box that includes such relays, is also not adaptable.

Further, the construction of the device in Nakamura is not capable of achieving the miniaturization of the presently claimed relay box. The device in Nakamura includes a plurality of "installation sockets" 39 that are of greater length than that of some of the semiconductors. This overcompensation in length is provided to allow for semiconductors, which may or may not be the same size, to be able to be included in any one of the sockets. However, when smaller semiconductors are used in any one of the sockets, space is wasted (see Nakamura, FIG. 1). In contrast, and as mentioned above, the relay elements of the present claims are all the same size, thus allowing for miniaturization of the installation sockets and therefore the relay box itself.

Accordingly, the vehicle-installed relay box of claim 1 is not merely an obvious rearrangement of elements as was alleged by the Patent Office at the interview. Nakamura does not teach or suggest the advantages described above, and one would not have found the present claims obvious from Nakamura.

For at least the foregoing reasons, independent claim 1, and dependent claims thereof, are patentable over the applied reference. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nakamura in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004-0080214 ("Metlitzky").

This rejection is moot in view of the above deficiencies of Nakamura that are not remedied by any aspect of Metlitzky. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Kevin K. Jones  
Registration No. 56,809

JAO:KKJ/hs

Attachments:

Replacement Sheet - Figs. 13 and 14

Date: July 18, 2007

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION</b> Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--